

ON THE COHOMOLOGY OF HYPERKÄHLER QUOTIENTS

LISA JEFFREY, YOUNG-HOON KIEM, AND FRANCES KIRWAN

ABSTRACT. This paper gives a partial desingularization construction for hyperkähler quotients and a criterion for the surjectivity of an analogue of the Kirwan map to the cohomology of hyperkähler quotients. This criterion is applied to some linear actions on hyperkähler vector spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

Hyperkähler manifolds are manifolds M equipped with a Riemannian metric g and three independent complex structures $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}$ compatible with the metric which satisfy $\mathbf{ij} = \mathbf{k} = -\mathbf{ji}$. They correspondingly have three symplectic forms $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$, or one real symplectic form ω_1 and one complex symplectic form $\omega_{\mathbb{C}} = \omega_2 + i\omega_3$. Suppose a compact connected Lie group K acts on M preserving the metric and the symplectic forms. We say the action is *Hamiltonian* if there are moment maps μ_i for each ω_i . It has been an outstanding problem how much of the package of properties of Hamiltonian group actions on symplectic manifolds extends to hyperkähler quotients

$$M///K := \mu^{-1}(0)/K$$

where $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$.

The first result of this paper is that the partial desingularization construction of [11] extends to hyperkähler quotients. For this, we fix a complex structure, say $\mathbf{i}$, which gives us a holomorphic moment map $\mu_{\mathbb{C}} = \mu_2 + \sqrt{-1}\mu_3 : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$, and note that with respect to this complex structure $M///K$ can be identified with the Kähler quotient of the complex subvariety $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0) = \mu_2^{-1}(0) \cap \mu_3^{-1}(0)$ of M .

In [11], a canonical way of partially resolving the singularities of the Kähler quotient $M//K = \mu_1^{-1}(0)/K$ is described. The most singular points of $M//K$ correspond to the points in $\mu_1^{-1}(0)$ of largest stabilizer groups in K . We blow up M^{ss} along the locus of points where the stabilizer has maximal dimension; this locus turns out to be smooth. Here M^{ss} denotes the open subset of *semistable* points in M , in other words the set of points whose $K^{\mathbb{C}}$ -orbit closure meets $\mu_1^{-1}(0)$. Let M_1 be the result of the blow-up. Then one finds that the maximal dimension of stabilizers on M_1^{ss} is strictly smaller than the corresponding maximal dimension on M^{ss} . We repeat this process until we cannot find a semistable point whose stabilizer is infinite. The final result of this process is an analytic variety $\widetilde{M^{ss}}//K$ which has at worst orbifold singularities, which we call the *partial desingularization* of the Kähler quotient.

In order to find a partial desingularization of a hyperkähler quotient, we take the proper transform $\widetilde{W//K}$ of $W//K$ in $\widetilde{M//K}$. By construction, we may describe

LCJ was partially supported by a grant from NSERC, YHK was partially supported by KOSEF grant R01-2007-000-20064-0 and FCK was supported by an EPSRC fellowship.

$\widetilde{W//K}$ by the following blow-up process. Let H be the stabilizer of a point in $\mu^{-1}(0) = W \cap \mu_1^{-1}(0)$ for which the dimension is maximal possible among such, and let H_0 be the identity component of H . Let Z_{H_0} be the fixed point set of H_0 in W . We blow up W^{ss} along $GZ_{H_0}^{ss}$ to get a variety W_1 . We repeat this process until, after finitely many steps, there are no semistable points with infinite stabilizers. Then we take the Kähler quotient of the resulting variety $\widetilde{W}$. This is our partial desingularization $\widetilde{W//K}$.

Since $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ can be very singular, it is by no means obvious why the proper transform $\widetilde{W//K}$ should have at worst orbifold singularities. However, we prove the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose there is at least one point in $\mu^{-1}(0)$ whose stabilizer is finite. The above blow-up procedure produces a surjective analytic map*

$$\Pi : \widetilde{W//K} \rightarrow W//K$$

such that

- (1) Π is an isomorphism on the open subset of the orbits of $x \in \mu^{-1}(0)$ where $d\mu_1$ is surjective;
- (2) $W//K$ has at worst orbifold singularities.

The advantage of this partial desingularization construction is that it works even when the hyperkähler moment map μ has no central regular value close to zero (in contrast to the method given by perturbing the hyperkähler moment map by adding a central constant). The disadvantage, on the other hand, is that $\widetilde{W//K}$ does not inherit a hyperkähler structure everywhere, and depends (only) on the choice of complex structure $\mathbf{i}$.

Next, we consider the restriction map, often called the Kirwan map,

$$\kappa : H_K^*(M) \longrightarrow H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0)) \cong H^*(\mu^{-1}(0)/K)$$

from the equivariant cohomology of M to the ordinary cohomology of the hyperkähler quotient $M///K = \mu^{-1}(0)/K$, when 0 is a regular value of μ . (All cohomology groups in this paper have rational coefficients.) More generally when 0 is not a regular value of μ we can consider the restriction map $H_K^*(M) \longrightarrow H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0))$ and try to use the partial desingularization construction described above to relate $H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0))$ to the intersection cohomology of the hyperkähler quotient $\mu^{-1}(0)/K$ (cf. Remark 4.9 below). In the setting of symplectic quotients the analogous map κ is surjective ([10] Theorem 5.4), at least when the moment map is proper, so a natural question is whether or not κ is surjective in the hyperkähler setting. In the preprint [12], the third named author attempted to study this by modifying the ideas and techniques in [10], but there is a crucial sign error underlying the argument of [12] Lemma 4.2 which invalidates the approach of [12, §4]. In this paper, we follow the approach in §5 of [12] and attempt to prove surjectivity in two stages:

- (1) surjectivity of the restriction $H_K^*(M) \rightarrow H_K^*(W)$, where $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$, by using equivariant Morse theory with respect to $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$,
- (2) surjectivity of the restriction $H_K^*(W) \rightarrow H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0))$ by using equivariant Morse theory with respect to $-\|\mu_1\|^2$.

Here the norm is induced from a fixed K -invariant inner product on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ of K , which we will use to identify $\mathfrak{k}$ with its dual throughout.

To deal with the first stage, we reproduce the following theorem of the third named author from [12, §5].

Theorem 1.2. *The Morse stratification of the function $\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ is K -equivariantly perfect if $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ is flow-closed.*

Here, a function f is *flow-closed* if the gradient flow of f from any point is contained in a compact set. Because [12] contains errors and is unpublished, we provide a full corrected proof of Theorem 1.2 in this paper.

There still remain two major difficulties in this approach. The first is the convergence issue of the gradient flows of the norm squares of the moment maps (that is, whether the norm squares are flow-closed), and the second is that W is in general singular. We avoid the second difficulty by using a generic rotation of the hyperkähler frame of $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}$. The three complex structures $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}$ give us in fact an S^2 -family of complex structures and the triple $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k})$ is nothing but a choice of an orthonormal frame. We show that $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ is smooth if we use a frame which is general in the sense of Definition 4.3 and 0 is a regular value of μ ; moreover, even when 0 is not a regular value of μ , for a general frame there are no non-minimal critical points of $\|\mu_1\|^2$ in W . Together with Theorem 1.2, this enables us to formulate a criterion for surjectivity of κ .

Theorem 1.3. *For a general choice of hyperkähler frame $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$, if*

- (1) $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ on M is flow-closed, and
- (2) $-\|\mu_1\|^2$ on W is flow-closed

then the restriction map

$$H_K^*(M) \rightarrow H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0))$$

is surjective.

When M is a quaternionic vector space $V = \mathbb{H}^n$ and the action is linear, the flow-closedness of $-\|\mu_1\|^2$ follows from work of Sjamaar [19]. So we obtain

Proposition 1.4. *Let K act linearly on $V = \mathbb{H}^n$, and let $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}$ be the holomorphic moment map corresponding to a general choice of hyperkähler frame $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$. If $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ on V is flow-closed, then the restriction map*

$$H_K^*(V) = H_K^* \longrightarrow H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0))$$

is surjective. Here $H_K^ = H^*(BK)$ denotes the equivariant cohomology of a point.*

Therefore, in the situation of Proposition 1.4 the surjectivity of κ follows from the following.

Conjecture 1.5. *For a Hamiltonian linear hyperkähler action of a compact Lie group K on a quaternionic vector space, $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ is flow-closed.*

Although it is purely a calculus problem in this linear case, the question of flow-closedness seems to be difficult. But we prove the following.

Proposition 1.6. *Conjecture 1.5 is true when K is the circle group $U(1)$.*

For certain other torus actions on quaternionic vector spaces, flow-closedness follows immediately from the $U(1)$ case (see Remark 6.3). Note that when K is a torus,

surjectivity of κ follows from the work of Konno [14], where the cohomology ring of the hyperkähler quotient is computed explicitly.

The layout of this paper is as follows. In §2 we review general results on hyperkähler quotients. In §3 we explain how to construct a partial desingularisation of a hyperkähler quotient by a series of blow-ups. In §4 we outline criteria for the surjectivity of the map κ from the equivariant cohomology of a hyperkähler manifold to the ordinary cohomology of the hyperkähler quotient. In §5 we reproduce the argument of [12, §5] which shows that $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ is equivariantly perfect if it is flow-closed. In §6 we apply this to hyperkähler quotients of linear actions on quaternionic vector spaces preserving the hyperkähler structure.

2. HYPERKÄHLER QUOTIENTS

In this section, we recall basic definitions and facts about hyperkähler quotients.

Definition 2.1. *A hyperkähler manifold is a Riemannian manifold (M, g) equipped with three complex structures $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}$ such that*

- (1) $\mathbf{ij} = \mathbf{k} = -\mathbf{ji}$,
- (2) $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}$ are orthogonal with respect to g ,
- (3) $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}$ are parallel with respect to the Levi-Civita connection of g .

Remark 2.2. (1) $T_p M \cong \mathbb{H}^n$ and so $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} M = 4n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.
 (2) There exists an S^2 -family of complex structures on M . Indeed, for any $(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 = 1$, it is easy to see that $a\mathbf{i} + b\mathbf{j} + c\mathbf{k}$ is a complex structure on M . There exists a complex manifold Z (the ‘twistor space’ of M) and a holomorphic map $\pi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \cong S^2$ such that the fiber over (a, b, c) is the complex manifold $(M, a\mathbf{i} + b\mathbf{j} + c\mathbf{k})$.
 (3) There exists an S^2 -family of (real) symplectic forms on M . Indeed, for each complex structure I in the S^2 -family described above, $\omega_I(-, -) = g(-, I-)$ defines a symplectic form on M which is Kähler with respect to I . We let $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$ denote the symplectic forms defined by $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}$ respectively.

Remark 2.3. The complex valued two-form $\omega_{\mathbb{C}} = \omega_2 + \sqrt{-1}\omega_3$ is holomorphic symplectic, so a hyperkähler manifold is always a holomorphic symplectic manifold. A holomorphic symplectic manifold which is compact and Kähler always admits a hyperkähler metric, but this is not true in general for non-compact M .

Examples 2.4. Examples of hyperkähler manifolds include

- (1) $\mathbb{H}^n = T^*\mathbb{C}^n$ and quotients of $\mathbb{H}^n$ by discrete group actions;
- (2) K3 surfaces, Hilbert schemes of points on a K3 surface and generalized Kummer varieties.

When X is a Kähler manifold, the cotangent bundle of X is holomorphic symplectic but is not necessarily hyperkähler.

Let K be a compact Lie group acting on a hyperkähler manifold M . Suppose that this action preserves the hyperkähler structure $(g, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k})$.

Definition 2.5. *A moment map for the K -action on M is a differentiable map*

$$\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3) : M \longrightarrow \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^3$$

satisfying

- (1) μ is K -equivariant, i.e. $\mu(kx) = \text{Ad}_k^* \mu(x)$ for $k \in K, x \in X$;

- (2) $\langle d\mu(v), \xi \rangle = (\omega_1(\xi_m, v), \omega_2(\xi_m, v), \omega_3(\xi_m, v))$ for $m \in M$, $v \in T_m M$ and $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^3$, where

$$\langle d\mu(v), \xi \rangle = (\langle d\mu_1(v), \xi_1 \rangle, \langle d\mu_2(v), \xi_2 \rangle, \langle d\mu_3(v), \xi_3 \rangle).$$

We say the action of K is Hamiltonian if a moment map exists. We call μ_1 the real moment map and $\mu_{\mathbb{C}} := \mu_2 + \sqrt{-1}\mu_3$ the complex moment map or holomorphic moment map with respect to the frame $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$.

Remark 2.6. (1) If μ is a moment map then any translation of μ by central elements of $\mathfrak{k}^*$ is again a moment map.

(2) It is straightforward to see that $\mu_{\mathbb{C}} : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$ is a holomorphic function with respect to $\mathbf{i}$.

Theorem 2.7. ([6]) *The smooth part of $M///K := \mu^{-1}(0)/K$ inherits a hyperkähler structure from M .*

- Examples 2.8.** (1) Suppose that $M = T^*\mathbb{C}^n = \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ and that the action of $K = U(1)$ is given by $\lambda(x, y) = (\lambda x, \lambda^{-1}y)$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Then up to the addition of constants we have $\mu_1(x, y) = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2}(x^\dagger x - y^\dagger y)$ and $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(x, y) = x^T y$. Hence $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ is an affine quadric hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ and the variation of $\mu^{-1}(c, 0, 0)/U(1)$ around $c = 0$ is the *Mukai flop*.
- (2) Suppose $M = T^*\text{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^k, \mathbb{C}^n) = \text{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^k, \mathbb{C}^n) \times \text{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^k)$ and $K = U(n)$ acts on M in the natural way. Then the action is Hamiltonian with $\mu_1(x, y) = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2}(xx^\dagger - y^\dagger y)$ and $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(x, y) = xy$.
- (3) Suppose $M = T^*\text{End}(\mathbb{C}^n) = \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^n) \times \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ and $K = U(n)$ acting by conjugation. Then up to the addition of central constants we have $\mu_1(B_1, B_2) = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2}([B_1, B_1^\dagger] + [B_2, B_2^\dagger])$ and $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(B_1, B_2) = [B_1, B_2]$.
- (4) Suppose K acts on M with moment map $\mu : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$. Let $\rho : H \rightarrow K$ be a homomorphism and let $\mathfrak{h}$ be the Lie algebra of H . A moment map for the induced action of H on M is the composition $M \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$ of μ and the dual $\mathfrak{k}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^*$ of the tangent map of ρ .
- (5) Let M_1, M_2 be two hyperkähler manifolds acted on by K in Hamiltonian fashion. Then the sum of the moment maps for M_1 and M_2 is a moment map for the diagonal action on the product $M_1 \times M_2$.
- (6) (ADHM spaces) Let $M = T^*\text{End}\mathbb{C}^n \times T^*\text{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^k, \mathbb{C}^n)$ and $K = U(n)$. Then

$$\mu_1(B_1, B_2, x, y) = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2}([B_1, B_1^\dagger] + [B_2, B_2^\dagger] + xx^\dagger - y^\dagger y)$$

and

$$\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(B_1, B_2, x, y) = [B_1, B_2] + xy.$$

The quiver variety construction is similar [1, 17].

- (7) (coadjoint orbits) If O is an orbit in $\mathfrak{g}^* = \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$, then $\omega_\alpha(\xi_\alpha, \eta_\alpha) = \langle \alpha, [\xi, \eta] \rangle$ defines a holomorphic symplectic form on O and $\mu_{\mathbb{C}} : O \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ is the complex moment map (cf. [16, 4]).

3. PARTIAL DESINGULARIZATION

Our first result in this paper allows us to construct a partial resolution of singularities of a hyperkähler quotient through a sequence of explicit blow-ups, which is closely related to the partial desingularization construction in [11].

Let $\mu : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$ be a moment map for a Hamiltonian K -action on a hyperkähler manifold M . Let $\pi : \mu^{-1}(0) \rightarrow \mu^{-1}(0)/K = M///K$ be the quotient map. If $x \in \mu^{-1}(0)$ has trivial stabilizer, then $\pi(x)$ is a smooth point of $M///K$ [6]. We fix a preferred complex structure $\mathbf{i}$ so that

$$\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_{\mathbb{C}}) : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes (\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{C})$$

and view M as a complex manifold with respect to $\mathbf{i}$, equipped with a holomorphic symplectic two-form $\omega_{\mathbb{C}} = \omega_2 + \sqrt{-1}\omega_3$. The function

$$\mu_{\mathbb{C}} = \mu_2 + i\mu_3 : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes \mathbb{C}$$

is holomorphic with respect to the complex structure $\mathbf{i}$ on M , and thus $W = \mu_2^{-1}(0) \cap \mu_3^{-1}(0)$ is a complex analytic subvariety of M . Moreover $\mu^{-1}(0)/K = W \cap \mu_1^{-1}(0)/K$ is the Kähler quotient of W by the action of K .

We can apply the partial desingularization construction of [11] to the Kähler quotient $\mu_1^{-1}(0)/K$ of M by K with respect to the Kähler structure corresponding to $\mathbf{i}$. This gives us a complex orbifold with a holomorphic surjection to $\mu_1^{-1}(0)/K$ which restricts to an isomorphism over the open subset of $\mu_1^{-1}(0)/K$ where the derivative of μ_1 is surjective. The proper transform $\widetilde{W//K}$ of $W//K = W \cap \mu_1^{-1}(0)/K = \mu^{-1}(0)/K$ in $\mu_1^{-1}(0)/K$ is the result of applying the partial desingularization construction of [11] to the complex subvariety W of M instead of M itself, and thus if W were nonsingular then it would follow immediately that $\widetilde{W//K}$ is a complex orbifold. However in general W is singular (indeed, if W is nonsingular then 0 is a regular value of μ and so no partial desingularization for $M///K = \mu^{-1}(0)/K$ is needed). Nonetheless, we will see in this section that $\widetilde{W//K}$ is always a complex orbifold: the blow-ups in its construction resolve the singularities coming from W at the same time as reducing the singularities created by the quotient construction to orbifold singularities.

The construction of $\widetilde{W//K}$ given in [11] is as follows. Let H_0 be the identity component of the stabilizer of a point in $\mu^{-1}(0) = W \cap \mu_1^{-1}(0)$ whose dimension is maximal possible among such, and let Z_{H_0} be the fixed point set of H_0 in W . First we blow W^{ss} up along $GZ_{H_0}^{ss}$, and give the resulting blow-up a Kähler structure which is a small perturbation of the pull-back of the Kähler structure on M restricted to W . Here W^{ss} denote the open subset of semistable points x in W , i.e. the $K^{\mathbb{C}}$ -orbit closure of x meets $\mu_1^{-1}(0)$. Then we repeat this process until, after finitely many steps, the points in the blow-up where the real moment map vanishes all have 0-dimensional stabilizers, and the resulting quotient is $\widetilde{W//K}$. Equivalently, by [11, Lemma 3.11], we can construct $\widetilde{W//K}$ directly from the quotient $W//K$ by a sequence of blow-ups.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose there is at least one point in $\mu^{-1}(0)$ whose stabilizer is finite. The above blow-up procedure produces a surjective analytic map*

$$\widetilde{W//K} \rightarrow W//K$$

such that

- (1) *it is an isomorphism on the open subset of the orbits of $x \in \mu^{-1}(0)$ where $d\mu_1$ is surjective;*
- (2) *$W//K$ has at worst orbifold singularities.*

Definition 3.2. We call $\widetilde{W//K}$ the partial desingularization of the hyperkähler quotient $M//K$ with respect to $\mathbf{i}$.

Item (1) is obvious since the blow-ups do not touch the orbits of $x \in \mu_1^{-1}(0)$ where $d\mu_1$ is surjective. In order to prove that $\widetilde{W//K}$ has only orbifold singularities even though W is in general singular, we shall prove that the singularities of W are all quadratic (Theorem 3.6). Then we can deduce from the following lemma that after blowing up W as described in the previous paragraphs, we obtain a variety $\widetilde{W}$ which is nonsingular along the proper transform of $\mu^{-1}(0)$. It then follows immediately from [11] that the quotient $\widetilde{W//K}$ of $\widetilde{W}$ has at worst orbifold singularities.

Lemma 3.3. Let $V \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a complex analytic variety defined only by homogeneous quadratic polynomials. Let $\pi : \tilde{V} \rightarrow V$ be the blow-up at 0. Then $\tilde{V}$ is isomorphic to a line bundle $L = \mathcal{O}_E(2)$ over the exceptional divisor $E = \pi^{-1}(0)$. In particular, E is normally nonsingular in $\tilde{V}$.

Proof. Let $A_1, \dots, A_r$ be symmetric matrices such that the quadratic forms $f_i(x) = x^t A_i x$, for $i = 1, \dots, r$, define V . Let $p : \widetilde{\mathbb{C}^n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ be the blow-up at 0 and consider the local chart

$$(y_1, \dots, y_n) \mapsto (y_1, y_1 y_2, \dots, y_1 y_r) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n).$$

Then the blow-up $\tilde{V}$ is the subvariety of $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}^n}$ defined by

$$\tilde{f}_i(y) = \frac{1}{y_1^2} f_i(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_n \end{pmatrix} A_i \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ y_2 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since all the defining equations for $\tilde{V}$ are independent of y_1 , $\tilde{V} \cap U_1 \cong \mathbb{C} \times (E \cap U_1)$ where $U_1 = \mathbb{C}^n = \{(y_1, \dots, y_n)\} \subset \widetilde{\mathbb{C}^n}$. Here E is the projective variety in $\mathbb{P}^{n-1} = \mathbb{P}\mathbb{C}^n$ defined by the homogeneous polynomials $f_1, \dots, f_r$. It is an easy exercise to check that these local trivializations for $\tilde{V}$ glue to give us the line bundle $L = \mathcal{O}_E(2)$, which is the restriction of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n-1}}(2)$ to E . $\square$

Remark 3.4. Suppose

$$V_k^0 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow V_1^0 \longrightarrow V_0^0 = V^0$$

is a sequence of blow-ups, which resolves the singularities of $V^0 = V - \{0\}$, with blow-up centers C_i^0 satisfying

- (1) C_i^0 is nonsingular;
- (2) $C_i^0 \subset V_{i-1}^0$ is the proper transform of its image B_i^0 in V^0 ;
- (3) $B_1^0 \subset B_2^0 \subset \cdots \subset B_k^0$;
- (4) each B_i^0 is conic in the sense that the closure B_i of B_i^0 in $\tilde{V}$ is the restriction of the line bundle L to $B_i \cap E$.

Let

$$\tilde{V}_k \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \tilde{V}_1 \longrightarrow \tilde{V}$$

be the blow-ups along the proper transforms $C_i \subset \tilde{V}_{i-1}$ of the closures $B_i \subset \tilde{V}$ of B_i^0 . Since the blow-up centers are all normally nonsingular along E by (4) above, the proper transform of E is normally nonsingular in $\tilde{V}_k$ and hence $\tilde{V}_k$ is nonsingular.

To show that the singularities of W are all quadratic, we begin with a holomorphic version of the equivariant Darboux theorem.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose ω_0, ω_1 are holomorphic symplectic two-forms on a complex manifold X and Y is a complex submanifold of X such that ω_0 and ω_1 coincide on $TX|_Y$. Suppose further that there exists an open neighborhood U of Y and a differentiable family of holomorphic maps $\varphi_t : U \rightarrow U$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$ such that*

$$\varphi_1 = \text{id}_U, \quad \varphi_0(U) = Y, \quad \varphi_t|_Y = \text{id}_Y \quad \forall t.$$

Then there exists an open neighborhood U' contained in U and a biholomorphic map $f : U' \rightarrow f(U')$ where $f(U')$ is an open subset of X such that

$$f|_Y = \text{id}_Y \quad \text{and} \quad f^*\omega_1 = \omega_0.$$

If a compact Lie group K acts on X with ω_0, ω_1, Y, U and φ_t all K -equivariant, then f can be chosen to commute with the action of K .

Proof. The proof is an obvious modification of Weinstein's in [5]. Let $\omega_t = \omega_0 + t\sigma$ where $\sigma = \omega_1 - \omega_0$. By assumption, σ is trivial on Y and $d\sigma = 0$. Let ξ_t denote the vector field of φ_t . Then

$$\sigma - \varphi_0^*\sigma = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt}(\varphi_t^*\sigma) dt = \int_0^1 \varphi_t^*(\iota(\xi_t)d\sigma) dt + d \int_0^1 \varphi_t^*(\iota(\xi_t)\sigma) dt = d\beta$$

where $\beta = \int_0^1 \varphi_t^*(\iota(\xi_t)\sigma) dt$. By our assumption, $\beta|_Y = 0$. We define a holomorphic vector field η_t on U by the equation $\iota(\eta_t)\omega_t = -\beta$. By shrinking U to a smaller open neighborhood U' if necessary, we can integrate η_t to obtain biholomorphic maps $f_t : U' \rightarrow X$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Then

$$f_1^*\omega_1 - \omega_0 = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt}(f_t^*\omega_t) dt = \int_0^1 f_t^*(\sigma + d\iota(\eta_t)\omega_t) dt = 0$$

as desired. Moreover if K acts on X with ω_0, ω_1, Y, U and φ_t all K -equivariant, then f_1 is also K -equivariant. $\square$

Let $x \in \mu^{-1}(0)$, and note that if $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathfrak{k}$ then $\alpha_x, \mathbf{i}\beta_x, \mathbf{j}\gamma_x$ and $\mathbf{k}\delta_x$ are mutually orthogonal, since, for example,

$$g(\mathbf{j}\gamma_x, \mathbf{k}\delta_x) = g(\mathbf{k}\mathbf{i}\gamma_x, \mathbf{k}\delta_x) = g(\mathbf{i}\gamma_x, \delta_x) = d\mu_1(\delta_x) \cdot \gamma = \text{ad}_\delta^*(\mu_1(x)) \cdot \gamma = 0$$

because $\mu_1(x) = 0$. We next find a local model for a neighborhood of x in M . Let H be the stabilizer of x in K , so that the complexification $H^\mathbb{C}$ is the stabilizer of x in the complexification $G = K^\mathbb{C}$, and let $Y = Gx \cong G/H^\mathbb{C}$ be its G -orbit. Further, let B be a ball in $T_x(Gx)^\perp = \mathbf{j}(V_x^\mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathcal{W}$ where $V_x = T_x(Kx)$ and

$$\mathcal{W} = (V_x \oplus \mathbf{i}V_x \oplus \mathbf{j}V_x \oplus \mathbf{k}V_x)^\perp.$$

Note that $\mathcal{W}$ is a quaternionic vector space with a linear action of $H^\mathbb{C}$. Let $S = H^\mathbb{C}B \subset T_x M$. Then the holomorphic slice theorem in [18] tells us that

$$G \times_{H^\mathbb{C}} S$$

is biholomorphic to an open neighborhood U of Y in M . Now consider

$$X = G \times_{H^\mathbb{C}} (\mathbf{j}V_x^\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathcal{W})$$

which is a hyperkähler manifold since it is a hyperkähler quotient of $T^*G \times \mathcal{W}$ by the action of H . By this quotient construction, we obtain a holomorphic symplectic form $\omega'_\mathbb{C}$ and a complex moment map

$$(3.1) \quad \mu'_\mathbb{C}(g, \mathbf{j}b, w) = \text{Ad}_g^*(b + \mu_\mathbb{C}^\mathcal{W}(w)) \quad g \in G, b \in V_x^\mathbb{C}, w \in \mathcal{W}$$

for the action of K on X where $\mu_\mathbb{C}^\mathcal{W}$ is the complex moment map for the action of H on $\mathcal{W}$. If we take the hyperkähler quotient of X by the action of K , then we obtain the hyperkähler quotient $\mathcal{W}///H$. Since $X \supset U$, the pull-back of the holomorphic symplectic form $\omega_\mathbb{C}$ of M is also holomorphic symplectic, and this coincides with $\omega'_\mathbb{C}$ on Y . On the other hand, X is a vector bundle over $Y = G/H^\mathbb{C}$ with fibers $\mathbf{j}V_x^\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathcal{W}$ and hence by shrinking the fibers, we obtain a family of holomorphic maps $\varphi_t : X \rightarrow X$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 3.5. Thus by Theorem 3.5, we obtain

Theorem 3.6. *There exists a biholomorphic map from a neighborhood of $G/H^\mathbb{C}$ in X to a neighborhood of the orbit Gx in M such that the pull-backs of $\omega_\mathbb{C}$ and $\mu_\mathbb{C}$ are $\omega'_\mathbb{C}$ and $\mu'_\mathbb{C}$ as at (3.1) above. Furthermore, in a K -invariant neighborhood of x , the embedding $W = \mu_\mathbb{C}^{-1}(0) \hookrightarrow M$ is biholomorphic to*

$$G \times_{H^\mathbb{C}} (0 \times (\mu_\mathbb{C}^\mathcal{W})^{-1}(0)) \hookrightarrow G \times_{H^\mathbb{C}} (\mathbf{j}V_x^\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathcal{W}).$$

In particular, the singularity of $M///K$ at $\pi(x)$ is precisely the hyperkähler quotient $\mathcal{W}///H$ of the vector space $\mathcal{W}$.

In the simplest case when $K = U(1)$ is the circle group, then it follows immediately from this theorem that the blow-up of W along the fixed point set of K is nonsingular, and hence $\widetilde{W}/K$ has only orbifold singularities.

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose that $K = U(1) = H$. Then the blow-up of $W = \mu_\mathbb{C}^{-1}(0)$ along Z_H where Z_H is the fixed point set of H in W is nonsingular, and $\widetilde{W}/K$ has only orbifold singularities.*

Proof. The hyperkähler moment map μ is locally constant on the K -fixed point set in M , so that Z_H is a union of some of its connected components and hence is nonsingular. In the local model X , we can identify $GZ_H = Z_H$ with $0 \times \mathcal{W}^H$ where $\mathcal{W}^H$ is the subspace of vectors fixed by H . Also W in this local model is $0 \times (\mu_\mathbb{C}^\mathcal{W})^{-1}(0)$. Since $\mu_\mathbb{C}^\mathcal{W}$ is homogeneous quadratic, $(\mu_\mathbb{C}^\mathcal{W})^{-1}(0)$ is the product of an affine quadric cone and $\mathcal{W}^H$ and so after the blow-up along Z_H we obtain a complex manifold whose Kähler quotient $\widetilde{W}/K$ has only orbifold singularities. $\square$

In general for any compact group K , we can describe the singularities of W along the blow-up center of the first blow-up in the partial desingularization process as follows. Let H_0 be the identity component of the stabilizer of a point in $\mu^{-1}(0)$, whose dimension is maximal possible among such. Then $GZ_{H_0}^{ss}$, where Z_{H_0} is the fixed point set of H_0 in W , is closed and nonsingular in a neighborhood of $\mu^{-1}(0)$. This follows from [11] Corollary 5.10 and Lemma 5.11 for the action of G on M , together with the local model of Theorem 3.6 and the fact that the hyperkähler moment map for the action of H_0 is locally constant on Z_{H_0} .

By Theorem 3.6, we can locally identify $GZ_{H_0}^{ss}$ with $G \times_{H^\mathbb{C}} (0 \times \mathcal{W}^{H_0})$ where $\mathcal{W}^{H_0}$ is the subspace of vectors fixed by H_0 . Also W in this local model is $G \times_{H^\mathbb{C}} (0 \times (\mu_\mathbb{C}^\mathcal{W})^{-1}(0))$. Since $\mu_\mathbb{C}^\mathcal{W}$ is homogeneous quadratic, $(\mu_\mathbb{C}^\mathcal{W})^{-1}(0)$ is the product of

an affine quadric cone and $\mathcal{W}^{H_0}$ and so after the blow-up along $GZ_{H_0}^{ss}$ we obtain a line bundle along the exceptional divisor.

By induction on the dimension of H_0 , suppose we could resolve the singularities of the complement of $GZ_{H_0}^{ss}$ by the partial desingularization process. Then we apply Remark 3.4 to conclude that W becomes smooth after the blow-ups in the partial desingularization process of $M//K$. Thus the proof of Theorem 3.1 is completed.

Remark 3.8. Note however that the construction of this partial desingularization $\widetilde{M//K}$ depends on the choice of preferred complex structure $\mathbf{i}$, and $\widetilde{M//K}$ does not inherit a hyperkähler structure from that of M .

Remark 3.9. Another way to (partially) resolve the singularities of a hyperkähler quotient is to perturb the moment map by a small central element in $\mathfrak{k}^*$. This is better in the sense that it gives us a partial desingularization which is hyperkähler again. However this resolution is possible only when the center contains regular values of the hyperkähler moment map and it does not apply to some examples, such as the moduli of Higgs bundles, or $\mathbb{H}^n \otimes sl(2)//SL(2)$. In fact, there are no hyperkähler resolutions for the latter singularity [7, 8].

Remark 3.10. One can use the partial desingularization process to calculate the intersection cohomology of singular hyperkähler varieties, such as the moduli space of rank 2 semistable Higgs bundles with trivial determinant over a Riemann surface. See [9] for details.

4. SURJECTIVITY CRITERION

In this section, we give a criterion for the surjectivity of the hyperkähler Kirwan map $H_K^*(M) \rightarrow H^*(M//K)$.

Let M be a hyperkähler manifold¹ on which a compact connected Lie group K acts preserving the hyperkähler structure. Suppose we have a hyperkähler moment map $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_{\mathbb{C}})$ which takes values in $\mathfrak{k}^* \otimes (\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$ for the action of K . Let T be a maximal torus of K . The following is a simple consequence of Mostow's theorem [13].

Lemma 4.1. *Consider the action of T on M and the stabilizers of points in M . Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the set of nontrivial subtori T' of T which are the identity components of the stabilizers of points in M . Then $\mathcal{T}$ is countable.*

As a consequence, the set of connected components of the fixed point sets of T' for $T' \in \mathcal{T}$ is countable and we write it as $\{Z_j \mid j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$. For each Z_j let T_j be the identity component of the stabilizer in T of a general point in Z_j .²

Lemma 4.2. *For any $\gamma \in \text{Lie}(T_j)$, $\langle \mu(Z_j), \gamma \rangle$ consists of a single point in $\mathbb{R}^3$.*

The proof of this lemma is elementary and we omit it.

Now for each j we choose $\gamma_j \in \text{Lie}(T_j)$ such that $\langle \mu(Z_j), \gamma_j \rangle \neq 0$ whenever

$$\rho_j := \sup\{\|\langle \mu(Z_j), \gamma \rangle\| : \|\gamma\| = 1, \gamma \in \text{Lie}(T_j)\} > 0.$$

We require no condition for γ_j when $\rho_j = 0$, in which case we have

$$\langle \mu(Z_j), \gamma \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for any } \gamma \in \text{Lie}(T_j).$$

¹A smooth manifold is a second countable Hausdorff space equipped with an atlas. It has at most countably many connected components.

²This makes sense because all the orbit type strata have even real codimension.

Since $\langle \mu(Z_j), \gamma_j \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is nonzero whenever $\rho_j > 0$, a general choice of hyperkähler frame $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$ (being uncountably many) satisfies the following condition:

$$(4.1) \quad \langle \mu(Z_j), \gamma_j \rangle \text{ are not of the form } (a, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ with } a \neq 0 \text{ for all } j \text{ with } \rho_j > 0, \text{ i.e.} \\ \langle \mu_{\mathbb{C}}(Z_j), \gamma_j \rangle \neq 0.$$

Definition 4.3. We say a hyperkähler frame $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$ is general in the group of frames $SO(3)$ if the above condition is satisfied.

Definition 4.4. As in [10] we let

$$W^{ss} = \{x \in W \mid \text{the gradient flow from } x \text{ with respect to } -\|\mu_1\|^2 \\ \text{has a limit point in } \mu_1^{-1}(0)\}.$$

We say that $x \in W$ is semistable if $x \in W^{ss}$.

Proposition 4.5. For a general hyperkähler frame $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$, if the gradient flow from each $x \in W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ with respect to $-\|\mu_1\|^2$ is contained in a compact set, then $W = W^{ss}$. If furthermore $\mu^{-1}(0)$ is smooth, $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ is smooth.

Proof. A point $x \in W$ is a critical point of $\|\mu_1\|^2$ if and only if $\mu_1(x)_x = 0$, where $\mu_1(x) \in \mathfrak{k}^*$ is identified with an element of $\mathfrak{k}$ by using the fixed invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{k}$. (See [10, Lemma 3.1].) Suppose $x \in W$ is a critical point of $\|\mu_1\|^2$ but $\mu_1(x) \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, replacing x with kx for some $k \in K$, we may assume $\mu_1(x) \in \text{Lie}(T)$ and $x \in Z_j$ for some j with $\text{Lie}(\text{Stab}_T x) = \text{Lie}(T_j)$. Let $\gamma = \mu_1(x) \in \text{Lie}(T_j)$. Then $\langle \mu_1(Z_j), \gamma \rangle$ is a nonzero constant $\|\gamma\|^2$. Hence $\rho_j > 0$, so $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(x) \neq 0$ because $\langle \mu_{\mathbb{C}}(x), \gamma_j \rangle = \langle \mu_{\mathbb{C}}(Z_j), \gamma_j \rangle \neq 0$ by (4.1). This is a contradiction to $x \in W$. Therefore $\mu_1(x) = 0$ whenever $x \in W$ is a critical point of $\|\mu_1\|^2$ and hence all the points in W are semistable. If $\mu^{-1}(0)$ is smooth, all the stabilizers in $G = K^{\mathbb{C}}$ of points in W are finite and hence $d\mu_{\mathbb{C}}$ is surjective and so W is smooth. $\square$

Definition 4.6. Let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function defined on a manifold. We say f is flow-closed if the gradient flow of f from any $x \in M$ is contained in a compact set.

Corollary 4.7. For a general hyperkähler frame $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$, if $-\|\mu_1\|^2$ on $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ and $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ on M are flow-closed, then the restriction map $H_K^*(M) \rightarrow H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0))$ is surjective.

Proof. The corollary follows from Theorem 5.1 below which says that $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ is equivariantly perfect if it is flow-closed. This theorem is proved in [12, §5]. Because [12] contains errors and is unpublished, we have reproduced an edited version of this section in Section 5.

By Theorem 5.1, the restriction map $H_K^*(M) \rightarrow H_K^*(W)$ is surjective, and by Proposition 4.5 above we have $W = W^{ss}$ and $H_K^*(W) \cong H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0))$. Thus we obtain the surjectivity. $\square$

We have proved

Theorem 4.8. (surjectivity criterion) For a general hyperkähler frame $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$, if

- (1) $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ on M is flow-closed, and

(2) $-\|\mu_1\|^2$ on $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ is flow-closed

then the restriction map

$$H_K^*(M) \rightarrow H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0))$$

is surjective. If furthermore 0 is a regular value of the hyperkähler moment map μ , then $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ is smooth and the map

$$\kappa : H_K^*(M) \rightarrow H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0)) \cong H^*(\mu^{-1}(0)/K)$$

is surjective.

Remark 4.9. Suppose that $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$ is a general hyperkähler frame satisfying conditions (1) and (2) of Theorem 4.8, so that the restriction map

$$(4.2) \quad H_K^*(M) \rightarrow H_K^*(W) = H_K^*(W^{ss}) \cong H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0))$$

is surjective, but suppose that 0 is not a regular value of the hyperkähler moment map μ . Then as in §3 we can construct a partial desingularization $\widetilde{M///K} = \widetilde{W}^{ss}/G$ of the hyperkähler quotient $M///K$ with respect to the preferred complex structure $\mathbf{i}$ (where $G = K^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the complexification of K and $\widetilde{W}^{ss}$ is an open subset of a blow-up of $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$), and the blow-down map induces a map on K -equivariant cohomology

$$(4.3) \quad H_K^*(W^{ss}) \rightarrow H_K^*(\widetilde{W}^{ss}) \cong H^*(\widetilde{W}^{ss}/G) = H^*(\widetilde{M///K}).$$

The intersection cohomology $IH^*(M///K)$ of $M///K$ (with respect to the middle perversity and rational coefficients) is a direct summand of $H^*(\widetilde{M///K})$ by the decomposition theorem of Beilinson, Bernstein, Deligne and Gabber [2, 6.2.5]. This direct decomposition is not in general canonical, but Woolf [20] shows that the partial desingularization construction (and more generally any G -stable resolution in the sense of [20, §3]) can be used to define a projection

$$(4.4) \quad H^*(\widetilde{M///K}) \rightarrow IH^*(M///K),$$

and also a projection

$$(4.5) \quad IH_K^*(W^{ss}) \rightarrow IH^*(W//K) = IH^*(M///K)$$

such that the composition of (4.5) with the canonical map from $H_K^*(W^{ss})$ to $IH_K^*(W^{ss})$ agrees with the composition of (4.4) with (4.3). The argument of [20] uses the decomposition theorem at the level of the equivariant derived category (see [3, §5]) as a decomposition of complexes of sheaves up to quasi-isomorphism, and it can be applied to M and restricted to its complex subvariety $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ to give a projection from the hypercohomology of the restriction to $W^{ss} = W$ of $\mathcal{IC}_K^\bullet(M^{ss})$ (which is just $H_K^*(W^{ss})$ since M is nonsingular) to the hypercohomology of the restriction to $W//K = M///K$ of $\mathcal{IC}^\bullet(M//K)$. We thus find that the partial desingularization construction gives us a map

$$H_K^*(M) \rightarrow IH^*(M///K)$$

which is the composition of (4.2), (4.3) and the projection (4.4) from $H^*(\widetilde{M///K})$ onto $IH^*(M///K)$, and factorises through a surjection from $H_K^*(M)$ to the hypercohomology of the restriction to $W//K = M///K$ of $\mathcal{IC}^\bullet(M//K)$.

5. MORSE FLOW OF THE NORM SQUARE OF THE COMPLEX MOMENT MAP

This section is a corrected version of part of the unpublished preprint [12] (mainly [12] §5). The proof of Lemma 5.6 differs from the original only because some minor errors (in particular an unimportant sign error) in [12] are corrected, and as a result the matrix in (5.5) differs by one sign from the matrix in [12] (first equation p. 35). The conclusion of §5 of [12] (that the norm square of the complex moment map is an equivariantly perfect Morse function) remains valid after these modifications. The proof of [12] Lemma 4.2 is, however, incorrect (as originally pointed out by Simon Donaldson), and the conclusions of [12, §4] are therefore invalid.

Consider the function $f_{23} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f_{23}(x) = \|\mu_2(x)\|^2 + \|\mu_3(x)\|^2 = \|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(x)\|^2.$$

For all $x \in M$ we have

$$(5.1) \quad \text{grad} f_{23}(x) = 2\mathbf{j}(\mu_2(x)_x - \mathbf{i}\mu_3(x)_x) = 2\mathbf{k}(\mu_3(x)_x + \mathbf{i}\mu_2(x)_x).$$

The purpose of this section is to prove the following.

Theorem 5.1. *The Morse stratification of the function $f_{23} = \|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ is K -equivariantly perfect if $-f_{23}$ is flow-closed.*

Lemma 5.2. *If $\text{grad} f_{23}(x) = 0$ and $\beta_2 = \mu_2(x)$ and $\beta_3 = \mu_3(x)$ then*

$$[\beta_2, \beta_3] = 0$$

Proof. Recall that

$$\mu_{\mathbb{C}} = \mu_2 + \sqrt{-1}\mu_3 : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^* \otimes \mathbb{C}$$

is K -equivariant with respect to the coadjoint action on $\mathfrak{k}^*$ and holomorphic with respect to the complex structure $\mathbf{i}$ on M . By (5.1) we have $(\beta_3)_x + \mathbf{i}(\beta_2)_x = 0$, and so applying the derivative of $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}$ at x to this we obtain

$$0 = [\beta_3 + \sqrt{-1}\beta_2, \mu_{\mathbb{C}}(x)] = [\beta_3 + \sqrt{-1}\beta_2, \beta_2 + \sqrt{-1}\beta_3] = 2[\beta_3, \beta_2].$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *If $x \in M$ then $\text{grad} f_{23}(x) = 0$ if and only if*

$$\mu_2(x)_x = \mu_3(x)_x = 0.$$

Proof. Suppose $\text{grad} f_{23}(x) = 0$. By Lemma 5.2 we have $[\beta_2, \beta_3] = 0$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_2(x)_x \cdot \mathbf{i}\mu_3(x)_x &= d\mu_1(\mu_2(x)_x) \cdot \mu_3(x) \\ &= [\mu_2(x), \mu_1(x)] \cdot \mu_3(x) \\ &= \mu_1(x) \cdot [\beta_2, \beta_3] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (5.1) the result follows. □

Suppose that $\text{grad} f_{23}(x) = 0$. Then by (5.1), the Hessian H_{23} of f_{23} at x is represented via the metric as the self-adjoint endomorphism of $T_x M$ given by

$$(5.2) \quad \frac{1}{2}H_{23}(\xi) = (\mathbf{j}\beta_2 + \mathbf{k}\beta_3)(\xi) + \mathbf{j}d\mu_2(x)(\xi)_x + \mathbf{k}d\mu_3(x)(\xi)_x$$

for $\xi \in T_x M$. Here $\beta_2 = \mu_2(x)$ and $\beta_3 = \mu_3(x)$ and $(\mathbf{j}\beta_2 + \mathbf{k}\beta_3)(\xi)$ denotes the action of $\mathbf{j}\beta_2 + \mathbf{k}\beta_3$ on $T_x M$ induced from the action of K and the fact that $(\mathbf{j}\beta_2 + \mathbf{k}\beta_3)_x = 0$.

As before let T be a maximal torus of K with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}$ and for $j = 2, 3$ let $\mathcal{B}_j$ be the set of $\beta \in \mathfrak{k}^*$ such that there is some $x \in X$ with $\mu_j(x) = \beta$ and $\beta_x = 0$.

Remark 5.4. When M is compact then any $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_j$ is the closest point to zero of the convex hull of a nonempty subset of the finite subset of $\mathfrak{t}^*$ which is the image under the T -moment map μ_j^T of the T -fixed point set in M (see [10] Lemma 3.13), and in particular $\mathcal{B}_j$ is finite. In general it follows from the fact that $\|\mu_j\|^2$ is a minimally degenerate Morse function in the sense of [10] that $\mathcal{B}_j$ is at most countable.

Let $\mathcal{B}_{23}$ be a set of representatives of the Weyl group orbits in $\mathcal{B}_2 \times \mathcal{B}_3$. For each $(\beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathcal{B}_{23}$ let

$$\text{Stab}(\beta_2, \beta_3) = \text{Stab}(\beta_2) \cap \text{Stab}(\beta_3)$$

where $\text{Stab}(\beta)$ denotes the stabilizer of β under the coadjoint action of K on $\mathfrak{t}^* \cong \mathfrak{t}$. Let T_{β_2, β_3} be the subtorus of T generated by β_2 and β_3 , and let

$$Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3} = \{x \in M \mid T_{\beta_2, \beta_3} \text{ fixes } x \text{ and } \mu_l(x) \cdot \beta_l = \|\beta_l\|^2, l = 2, 3\}$$

The argument of [10] Lemma 3.15 shows the following.

Lemma 5.5. *The set of critical points for f_{23} is the disjoint union of the closed subsets $\{C_{\beta_2, \beta_3} \mid (\beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathcal{B}_{23}\}$ of M , where*

$$C_{\beta_2, \beta_3} = K(Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3} \cap \mu_2^{-1}(\beta_2) \cap \mu_3^{-1}(\beta_3)).$$

Proof. Suppose $\text{grad} f_{23}(x) = 0$. By Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3 we have

$$[\mu_2(x), \mu_3(x)] = 0$$

and $\mu_2(x)_x = 0 = \mu_3(x)_x$. Hence there exists $k \in K$ such that $\mu_2(kx)$ and $\mu_3(kx)$ both lie in $\mathfrak{t}$ and

$$\mu_2(kx)_{kx} = 0 = \mu_3(kx)_{kx}.$$

Thus we have $\mu_2(kx) = \beta_2$ and $\mu_3(kx) = \beta_3$ for some $(\beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathcal{B}_2 \times \mathcal{B}_3$, and multiplying k by a suitable element of the normalizer of T in K we may assume that $(\beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathcal{B}_{23}$. The result follows. $\square$

To show that f_{23} is a minimally degenerate Morse function in the sense of §11 of [10], it is enough to find for each $(\beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathcal{B}_{23}$ a locally closed submanifold R_{β_2, β_3} of M which contains C_{β_2, β_3} and has the following properties. R_{β_2, β_3} must be closed in a neighbourhood of C_{β_2, β_3} . Moreover there should be a smooth subbundle U of $TM|_{R_{\beta_2, \beta_3}}$ such that $TM|_{R_{\beta_2, \beta_3}} = U + TR_{\beta_2, \beta_3}$ and for each $x \in C_{\beta_2, \beta_3}$ the restriction to U_x of the Hessian H_{23} of f_{23} at x is nondegenerate. Then the normal bundle to R_{β_2, β_3} in M is isomorphic to a quotient of U and U splits near C_{β_2, β_3} as $U^+ + U^-$ where the restriction of the Hessian H_{23} to U_x^+ is positive definite and to U_x^- is negative definite for all x . One finds that the intersection of a small neighborhood of C_{β_2, β_3} in M with the image of U^+ under the exponential map $\text{Exp} : TM \rightarrow M$ satisfies the conditions for a minimizing manifold for f_{23} along C_{β_2, β_3} . By [10] (4.21) for $l = 2, 3$ we have

$$K(Z_{\beta_l} \cap \mu_l^{-1}(\beta_l)) \cong K \times_{\text{Stab} \beta_l} (Z_{\beta_l} \cap \mu_l^{-1}(\beta_l))$$

and $KZ_{\beta_l} \cong K \times_{\text{Stab} \beta_l} Z_{\beta_l}$ near $K(Z_{\beta_l} \cap \mu_l^{-1}(\beta_l))$. Therefore

$$(5.3) \quad C_{\beta_2, \beta_3} = K \times_{\text{Stab}(\beta_2, \beta_3)} (Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3} \cap \mu_3^{-1}(\beta_3))$$

and $KZ_{\beta_2, \beta_3} = K \times_{\text{Stab}(\beta_2, \beta_3)} Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3}$ near C_{β_2, β_3} . In particular KZ_{β_2, β_3} is smooth near C_{β_2, β_3} (cf. [10] Cor 4.11). If $x \in Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3}$ then $\mu_l(x) \cdot \beta_l = \|\beta_l\|^2$ for $l = 2, 3$ so $f_{23}(x) \geq \|\beta_2\|^2 + \|\beta_3\|^2$ with equality if and only if $\mu_2(x) = \beta_2$ and $\mu_3(x) = \beta_3$.

Hence the restriction of f_{23} to KZ_{β_2, β_3} takes its minimum value precisely on C_{β_2, β_3} . Thus to prove that f_{23} is minimally degenerate it suffices to prove

Lemma 5.6. *For any $x \in Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3} \cap \mu_2^{-1}(\beta_2) \cap \mu_3^{-1}(\beta_3)$ there is a complement U_x to $T_x KZ_{\beta_2, \beta_3}$ in $T_x M$ varying smoothly with x such that H_{23} restricts to a nondegenerate bilinear form on U_x and $U_{sx} = s(U_x)$ for all $s \in \text{Stab}(\beta_2, \beta_3)$.*

Proof. From (5.2) it is easy to check that the subspace

$$T_x Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3} + \mathfrak{k}_x + \mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{k}_x + \mathfrak{j}\mathfrak{k}_x + \mathfrak{k}\mathfrak{k}_x$$

of $T_x M$ is invariant under the action of H_{23} regarded as a self-adjoint endomorphism of $T_x M$. Hence so is its orthogonal complement V_x say, in $T_x M$. If $\xi \in V_x$ then

$$d\mu_2(x)(\xi) \cdot b = \xi \cdot \mathfrak{j}b_x = 0$$

for all $b \in \mathfrak{k}$, so $d\mu_2(x)(\xi) = 0$ and similarly $d\mu_3(x)(\xi) = 0$. Hence

$$\frac{1}{2}H_{23}(\xi) = \mathfrak{j}\beta_2(\xi) + \mathfrak{k}\beta_3(\xi)$$

so that the restriction of $\frac{1}{2}H_{23}$ to V_x coincides with the restriction of the Hessian of the function $\mu_2^{(\beta_2)} + \mu_3^{(\beta_3)}$ on M , where $\mu_l^{(\beta_l)}(x)$ is defined as $\mu_l(x) \cdot \beta_l$. But Z_{β_2, β_3} is a union of components of the set of critical points for this function. Because this function is a nondegenerate Morse function on M by the following lemma, the restriction of H_{23} to V_x is nondegenerate. $\square$

Lemma 5.7. [12, Lemma 3.9] *The function $\mu^{(\beta)} := \mu_2^{(\beta_2)} + \mu_3^{(\beta_3)}$ is a nondegenerate Morse-Bott function.*

Proof. The gradient of $\mu^{(\beta)}$ at $x \in X$ is

$$\text{grad}\mu^{(\beta)}(x) = \mathfrak{j}(\beta_2)_x + \mathfrak{k}(\beta_3)_x.$$

Since

$$\mathfrak{j}(\beta_2)_x \cdot \mathfrak{k}(\beta_3)_x = \mathfrak{i}(\beta_2)_x \cdot (\beta_3)_x = d\mu_1((\beta_3)_x) \cdot \beta_2 = [\beta_3, \mu_1(x)] \cdot \beta_2 = \mu_1(x) \cdot [\beta_2, \beta_3] = 0,$$

the set of critical points is precisely the fixed point set of the subtorus T_β which is the closure of the subgroup generated by $\exp \mathbb{R}\beta_2$ and $\exp \mathbb{R}\beta_3$. Thus every connected component is a submanifold of M . So it suffices to prove that its Hessian at any critical point is nondegenerate in directions orthogonal to the critical set. Let H_2, H_3 and $H = H_2 + H_3$ be the Hessians at x for $\mu_2^{(\beta_2)}, \mu_3^{(\beta_3)}$ and $\mu^{(\beta)}$. Choose local coordinates near x such that T_β acts linearly and the metric is given by a matrix $\rho_{pq}(y)$ with $\rho_{pq}(x) = \delta_{pq}$. Since

$$0 = \mathfrak{j}(\beta_2)_y \cdot \mathfrak{k}(\beta_3)_y = \text{grad}\mu_2^{(\beta_2)}(y) \cdot \text{grad}\mu_3^{(\beta_3)}(y)$$

for all $y \in M$, we have

$$\sum_{p,q} \frac{\partial \mu_2^{(\beta_2)}}{\partial y_q}(y) \rho_{pq}^{-1}(y) \frac{\partial \mu_3^{(\beta_3)}}{\partial y_p}(y) = 0$$

for all y , and since

$$\text{grad}\mu_2^{(\beta_2)}(x) = 0 = \text{grad}\mu_3^{(\beta_3)}(x),$$

differentiating twice gives

$$H_2 H_3 + H_3 H_2 = 0$$

which gives us $H^2 = (H_2 + H_3)^2 = H_2^2 + H_3^2$. If $H\xi = 0$,

$$0 = \|H\xi\|^2 = \langle H^2\xi, \xi \rangle = \langle H_2^2\xi, \xi \rangle + \langle H_3^2\xi, \xi \rangle = \|H_2\xi\|^2 + \|H_3\xi\|^2$$

and thus $H_2\xi = 0 = H_3\xi$. Therefore, if $H\xi = 0$, ξ is tangent to the fixed point set of T_β because $\mu_2^{(\beta_2)}$ and $\mu_3^{(\beta_3)}$ are nondegenerate. $\square$

Conclusion of Proof of Lemma 5.6: It follows from Lemma 5.7 that the restriction of H_{23} to V_x is nondegenerate. Therefore it suffices to show that there is a complement W_x to $T_x KZ_{\beta_2, \beta_3}$ in

$$T_x Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3} + \mathfrak{k}_x + \mathbf{i}\mathfrak{k}_x + \mathbf{j}\mathfrak{k}_x + \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{k}_x$$

varying smoothly with x such that H_{23} is nondegenerate on W_x and $W_{sx} = s(W_x)$ for all $s \in \text{Stab}(\beta_2, \beta_3)$. For then we may take $U_x = V_x + W_x$.

From (5.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}H_{23}(\mathbf{j}a_x) &= -[\beta_2, a]_x + \mathbf{j}A_x(a)_x - \mathbf{i}[\beta_3, a]_x + \mathbf{k}[\beta_1, a]_x \\ \frac{1}{2}H_{23}(\mathbf{k}a_x) &= -[\beta_3, a]_x + \mathbf{k}A_x(a)_x + \mathbf{i}[\beta_2, a]_x - \mathbf{j}[\beta_1, a]_x \end{aligned}$$

where $A_x : \mathfrak{k} \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}$ is the self-adjoint endomorphism defined by

$$A_x(a) \cdot b = a_x \cdot b_x$$

for all $a, b \in \mathfrak{k}$.

Hence, via the projection

$$(5.4) \quad \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{k} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{k}_x + \mathbf{i}\mathfrak{k}_x + \mathbf{j}\mathfrak{k}_x + \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{k}_x,$$

the endomorphism $\frac{1}{2}H_{23}$ lifts to the endomorphism of $\mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{k}$ given by the matrix

$$(5.5) \quad \mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -Ad\beta_2 & -Ad\beta_3 \\ 0 & 0 & -Ad\beta_3 & Ad\beta_2 \\ 0 & 2Ad\beta_3 & A_x & -Ad\beta_1 \\ 0 & -2Ad\beta_2 & Ad\beta_1 & A_x \end{bmatrix}$$

acting as left multiplication on column vectors.

Since $(\beta_2)_x = (\beta_3)_x = 0$ and μ_1 is K -equivariant, we have $[\beta_2, \beta_1] = [\beta_3, \beta_1] = 0$, and also $[\beta_2, \beta_3] = 0$. Hence $Ad\beta_1$, $Ad\beta_2$ and $Ad\beta_3$ all commute, and so do A_x , $Ad\beta_2$ and $Ad\beta_3$.

To identify the kernel of $\mathcal{M}$, consider the set of (ξ, ζ, η) satisfying

$$\mathcal{M}' \begin{bmatrix} \xi \\ \zeta \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

where the matrix $\mathcal{M}'$ consists of the second, third and fourth rows and columns of the matrix $\mathcal{M}$, in other words

$$(5.6) \quad \mathcal{M}' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -Ad\beta_3 & Ad\beta_2 \\ 2Ad\beta_3 & A_x & -Ad\beta_1 \\ -2Ad\beta_2 & Ad\beta_1 & A_x \end{bmatrix}.$$

For simplicity, write $A = A_x$, $B_1 = Ad\beta_1$, $B_2 = Ad\beta_2$, $B_3 = Ad\beta_3$.

The adjugate matrix³ of $\mathcal{M}'$ is

$$\mathcal{M}'_{adj} = \begin{bmatrix} A^2 + (B_1)^2 & B_1B_2 + AB_3 & B_1B_3 - AB_2 \\ 2(B_1B_2 - AB_3) & 2(B_2)^2 & 2B_2B_3 \\ 2(B_1B_3 + AB_2) & 2B_2B_3 & 2(B_3)^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

By left multiplying $\mathcal{M}'$ by its adjugate matrix, we obtain

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{bmatrix} 2A((B_2)^2 + (B_3)^2) & (B_1A - AB_1)B_2 & (B_1A - AB_1)B_3 \\ 0 & 2A((B_2)^2 + (B_3)^2) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2A((B_2)^2 + (B_3)^2) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \xi \\ \zeta \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Since A , B_2 and B_3 commute and A is self-adjoint while B_2 and B_3 are skew-adjoint, these matrices can be simultaneously diagonalized with real and purely imaginary eigenvalues respectively. The Lie algebra $stab(x)$ of the stabilizer of x in K is contained in $stab(\beta_2, \beta_3) = stab(\beta_2) \cap stab(\beta_3)$ where $stab(\beta_i)$ denotes the Lie algebra of $Stab\beta_i$. So the kernel of A is contained in the intersection of the kernel of B_2 and that of B_3 .

The equations given by the lower two rows of (5.7) tell us that ζ and η are in the intersection of the kernels of B_2 and B_3 . Now consider the equation determined by the top row:

$$2A(B_2^2 + B_3^2)\xi + (B_1A - AB_1)B_2\zeta + (B_1A - AB_1)B_3\eta = 0.$$

Since ζ and η are in the kernel of B_2 and B_3 , this reduces to

$$A(B_2^2 + B_3^2)\xi = 0$$

so we conclude that ξ is also in the kernel of B_2 and B_3 . Therefore, the kernel of $\mathcal{M}$ is contained in the subspace

$$L := \mathfrak{k} \oplus stab(\beta_2, \beta_3) \oplus stab(\beta_2, \beta_3) \oplus stab(\beta_2, \beta_3).$$

In other words, if we let

$$\phi : \mathfrak{k}^{\oplus 4} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{k}^{\oplus 4}$$

denote the linear transformation defined by $\mathcal{M}$, we proved that $\phi^{-1}(0) \subset L$. By a similar calculation, we can furthermore prove that

$$\phi^{-1}(L) \subset L.$$

Indeed, if $(\alpha, \xi, \zeta, \eta) \in \phi^{-1}(L)$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{M} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \xi \\ \zeta \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \\ c \\ d \end{bmatrix}$$

with $b, c, d \in stab(\beta_2, \beta_3)$, we multiply the 4×4 matrix $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'_{adj}$ which contains $\mathcal{M}'_{adj}$ as the lower right 3×3 submatrix and whose other entries are zero. Because $b, c, d \in stab(\beta_2, \beta_3)$, the right hand side $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'_{adj}(a, b, c, d)^t$ equals $(0, (A^2 + B_1^2)b, 0, 0)^t$.

³Note that for matrices of complex numbers the product of a matrix M and its adjugate is the identity matrix times the determinant of M . This is consistent with (5.7), except that we do not know that B_1 and A commute – if they do commute, the matrix in (5.7) is simply the determinant of $\mathcal{M}'$ times the identity matrix.

The left hand side is the same as the 4×4 matrix which contains the left hand side of (5.7) as the lower right submatrix and whose other entries are zero. By comparing the third and fourth entries, we obtain $\zeta, \eta \in \text{stab}(\beta_2, \beta_3)$. But then the second entry b of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \xi, \zeta, \eta)^t$ is zero by the definition of $\mathcal{M}$. This implies that $(A^2 + B_1^2)b = 0$ and so we obtain the equation (5.7), which tells us that $\xi \in \text{stab}(\beta_2, \beta_3)$ as well. Hence, $(\alpha, \xi, \zeta, \eta) \in L$ as desired.

It is obvious from the commutativity of A (resp. B_1) with B_2, B_3 that $\phi(L) \subset L$. So we obtain the induced homomorphism

$$\bar{\phi} : \mathfrak{k}^{\oplus 4}/L \longrightarrow \mathfrak{k}^{\oplus 4}/L$$

which is injective because $\phi^{-1}(L) \subset L$. Hence $\bar{\phi}$ is an isomorphism.

The projection (5.4) maps L into $T_x K Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3}$ because Z_{β_2, β_3} is a $\text{Stab}(\beta_2, \beta_3)$ -invariant hyperkähler submanifold. If we further compose (5.4) with the projection to the orthogonal complement W_x of $T_x K Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3}$, we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{k}^{\oplus 4} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{k}^{\oplus 4} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W_x & \longrightarrow & W_x \end{array}$$

which induces a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{k}^{\oplus 4}/L & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathfrak{k}^{\oplus 4}/L \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W_x & \longrightarrow & W_x. \end{array}$$

It is now obvious that the bottom arrow is an isomorphism. Therefore the restriction of H_{23} to W_x is nondegenerate. So the proof of Lemma 5.6 is complete by taking W_x to be the orthogonal complement of $T_x K Z_{\beta_2, \beta_3}$.

This completes the proof that f_{23} is a minimally degenerate Morse function and so we deduce that f_{23} is an equivariantly perfect Morse function if it is flow-closed.

6. HYPERKÄHLER QUOTIENTS OF QUATERNIONIC VECTOR SPACES

In this section we consider linear actions on hyperkähler vector spaces.

Let $V = \mathbb{C}^{2n} = T^*\mathbb{C}^n$ be a hyperkähler vector space. Suppose we have a Hamiltonian hyperkähler linear action of a compact Lie group K on V . Fix a *general hyperkähler frame* $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$. Let μ (resp. $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}$) be the hyperkähler (resp. complex) moment map for this action. From the surjectivity criterion in Section 4, we obtain the following.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ on V is flow-closed. If 0 is a regular value of μ , the restriction map*

$$H_K^*(V) = H_K^* \longrightarrow H_K^*(\mu^{-1}(0)) \cong H^*(\mu^{-1}(0)/K)$$

is surjective.

This proposition is relevant to Hilbert schemes of points in $\mathbb{C}^2$, ADHM spaces, hypertoric manifolds and quiver varieties, etc.

Proof. Sjamaar has proved that $-\|\mu_1\|^2$ is flow-closed on V and hence on $W = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ ([19, (4.6)]), so the hypotheses of Theorem 4.8 are satisfied. $\square$

We believe that it is likely that the assumption on flow-closedness of $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ in Proposition 6.1 is always satisfied.

Conjecture 6.2. *For a linear hyperkähler action on a hyperkähler vector space of a compact Lie group K , $-\|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}\|^2$ is flow-closed.*

Although it is purely a calculus problem, we do not know how to prove this conjecture, though we have managed to prove the circle case.

Remark 6.3. Certain other cases follow from the circle case. For example if the conjecture is true for the action of K_1 on V_1 and for the action of K_2 on V_2 then it is true for the action of $K_1 \times K_2$ on $V_1 \oplus V_2$, so the conjecture follows for suitable torus actions.

Proposition 6.4. *Conjecture 6.2 is true for the circle group $U(1)$.*

Let $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$. We denote by $\bar{x}, \bar{y}$ the complex conjugates of x, y . By a suitable change of variables and ignoring the variables for which the weights are zero, we may assume

$$\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(x, y) = x \cdot y - c = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i - c$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Let

$$f(x, y) = |\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(x, y)|^2 \geq 0$$

and let $\gamma(t)$ be the integral curve of the vector field $-\text{grad} f$ from a given $(x_0, y_0) \notin \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$.

Lemma 6.5. *$\{\gamma(t)\}$ is contained in a compact subset of $\mathbb{C}^{2n}$.*

Proof. Let

$$\rho(x, y) = |x|^2 + |y|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (|x_i|^2 + |y_i|^2) \geq 0.$$

By direct computation, we know

$$\text{grad} f = 2\mu_{\mathbb{C}} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{y} \\ \bar{x} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{grad} \rho = 2 \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $\gamma(t) \in \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ for some t then γ is constant and there is nothing to prove. So we assume $\gamma(t) \notin \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ for all $t \geq 0$. On $\mathbb{C}^{2n} - \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$, $\sqrt{f} = |\mu_{\mathbb{C}}| \geq 0$ is differentiable and

$$\text{grad} \sqrt{f} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{f}} \text{grad} f.$$

If we denote by $\langle, \rangle$ the ordinary inner product of $\mathbb{R}^{4n} \cong \mathbb{C}^{2n}$, we have

$$\langle \text{grad} \sqrt{f}, \text{grad} f \rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{f}} |\text{grad} f|^2 = \frac{4|\mu_{\mathbb{C}}|^2}{2\sqrt{f}} (|x|^2 + |y|^2) = 2\rho\sqrt{f},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{grad} \rho, \text{grad} f \rangle &= 8 \text{Re} \mu_{\mathbb{C}}(\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}) = 8 \text{Re} \mu_{\mathbb{C}}(\bar{\mu}_{\mathbb{C}} + \bar{c}) \\ &= 8 \text{Re}(f + \bar{c}\mu_{\mathbb{C}}) \geq 8f - 8|c|\sqrt{f}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\langle \text{grad}(\rho + \sqrt{f}), \text{grad} f \rangle \geq 8f + 2\sqrt{f}(\rho - 4|c|)$$

and hence $(\rho + \sqrt{f})(\gamma(t))$ is decreasing whenever $\rho = |x|^2 + |y|^2 \geq 4|c|$.

Now we claim, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$(\rho + \sqrt{f})(\gamma(t)) \leq \max\{4|c| + \sqrt{f_0}, \rho_0 + \sqrt{f_0}\}$$

where $\rho_0 = \rho(x_0, y_0)$ and $f_0 = f(x_0, y_0)$. The proposition follows from this claim because $\rho = |x|^2 + |y|^2$ is bounded along the curve $\gamma(t)$ since $\rho + \sqrt{f}$ is bounded and $\sqrt{f} \geq 0$.

It remains to show the claim above. Since f is decreasing along $\gamma(t)$ by the definition of $\gamma(t)$, $\sqrt{f}$ is also decreasing for all $t \geq 0$. If $\rho(\gamma(t)) \leq 4|c|$ for some $t \geq 0$, $\rho + \sqrt{f} \leq 4|c| + \sqrt{f_0}$ at $\gamma(t)$.

If $\rho(\gamma(t)) > 4|c|$ for some $t \geq 0$, then there are two possibilities.

- (1) γ on $[0, t]$ stays outside of the sphere $\rho = 4|c|$: in this case, since $\rho + \sqrt{f}$ is decreasing on $[0, t]$, $\rho + \sqrt{f} \leq \rho_0 + \sqrt{f_0}$.
- (2) γ on $[0, t]$ moves into and out of the sphere $\rho = 4|c|$: then let τ be the greatest element of $[0, t]$ satisfying $\rho(\gamma(\tau)) \leq 4|c|$. Then $\tau < t$ and because $\rho(\gamma) > 4|c|$ on the interval $(\tau, t]$, it follows that $\rho + \sqrt{f}$ at $\gamma(t)$ is less than $\rho + \sqrt{f}$ at $\gamma(\tau)$, which is less than or equal to $4|c| + \sqrt{f_0}$ since $\rho(\gamma(\tau)) \leq 4|c|$ and $\sqrt{f}$ is decreasing. Hence $\rho + \sqrt{f} \leq 4|c| + \sqrt{f_0}$.

So we are done. $\square$

Examples 6.6. Consider the action of $\mathbb{C}^{2n} = \mathbb{C}^n \oplus \mathbb{C}^n$ with weights 1 and -1 as usual. For $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(x, y) = \sum x_i y_i - c$ for $c \neq 0$. There is only one non-minimal critical point which is the origin. By direct computation, the Hessian at the origin has $2n$ positive and $2n$ negative eigenvalues. Hence we deduce that the Poincaré polynomial of the hyperkähler quotient is

$$\frac{1}{1-t^2} - \frac{t^{2n}}{1-t^2} = P_t(\mathbb{P}^{n-1}) = P_t(T^*\mathbb{P}^{n-1}).$$

REFERENCES

1. M. Atiyah, V. Drinfeld, N. Hitchin and Y. Manin. Construction of instantons. *Phys. Lett. A* **65** (1978), 185–187.
2. A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein and P. Deligne. Faisceaux pervers. *Analysis and topology on singular spaces, I (Luminy, 1981)*, 5–171, Astrisque, 100, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1982.
3. J. Bernstein and V. Lunts. Equivariant sheaves and functors. *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1578**, Springer-Verlag 1994.
4. O. Biquard and P. Gauduchon. La metrique hyperkahlerienne des orbites coadjointes de type symetrique d'un groupe de Lie complexe semi-simple. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I Math.* **323** (1996), no.12, 1259–1264.
5. V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg, *Symplectic techniques in physics*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
6. N. Hitchin, A. Karlhede, U. Lindström and M. Rocek, Hyperkähler quotients and supersymmetry. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **108** (1987) 535–589.
7. D. Kaledin, M. Lehn and C. Sorger. Singular symplectic moduli spaces. *Invent. Math.* **164** (2006), no. 3, 591–614.
8. Y.-H. Kiem and S.-B. Yoo. The stringy E-function of the moduli space of Higgs bundles with trivial determinant. *Math. Nachr.* **281** (2008), 817–838.
9. Y.-H. Kiem and S.-B. Yoo. The intersection cohomology of the moduli space of Higgs bundles with trivial determinant. In preparation.
10. F. Kirwan. *Cohomology of quotients in symplectic and algebraic geometry*. Princeton University Press, 1984.
11. F. Kirwan. Partial desingularisation of quotients of nonsingular varieties and their Betti numbers. *Ann. Math.* **122** (1985) 41–85l
12. F. Kirwan. On the topology of hyperkähler quotients. IHES preprint IHES/M/85/35, 1985.

13. G.D. Mostow. On a conjecture of Montgomery, *Ann. Math.* **65** (1957) 513–516.
14. H. Konno, Cohomology rings of toric hyperkähler manifolds. *International J. of Math.* **11** (2000) 1001–1026.
15. H. Konno, Variation of toric hyperkähler manifolds. *International J. of Math.* **14** (2003) 289–311.
16. P. Kronheimer. A hyperkähler structure on coadjoint orbits of a semisimple complex group. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* (2) **42** (1990), no.2, 193–209.
17. H. Nakajima. Instantons on ALE spaces, quiver varieties and Kac-Moody algebras, *Duke Math. J.* **76** (1994) 365–416.
18. R. Sjamaar. Holomorphic slices, symplectic reduction and multiplicities of representations. *Ann. Math.* **141** (1995) 87–129.
19. R. Sjamaar. Convexity properties of the moment map re-examined. *Adv. Math.* **138** (1998) 46–91.
20. J. Woolf. The decomposition theorem and the intersection cohomology of quotients in algebraic geometry. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **182** (2003), 317–328.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, CANADA
E-mail address: `jeffrey@math.toronto.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, SEOUL NATIONAL
UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 151-747, KOREA
E-mail address: `kiem@math.snu.ac.kr`

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, OXFORD UNIVERSITY, UK
E-mail address: `kirwan@maths.ox.ac.uk`